**Collection of Fees**

396. SHR1 S. AGNIRAJ: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of fees collected under the Companies Act, 1956 during the financial years 1999-2000 and 2000-2001;

(b) the total expenditure incurred during the said period for the administration of the Companies Act, 1956;

(c) whether there is any relation between services rendered and fees collected by the Department; and

(d) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRIARUN JAITLEY):

(a) 1999-2000 Rs. 189.62 crores 2000-2001 Rs. 503.18 crores

(b) 1999-2000 Rs. 30.71 crores 2000-2001 Rs. 36.81 crores

(c) and (d) the fees to be paid to the Registrar has been prescribed by the Central Government u/s 611 of Companies Act, 1956. The rate of fees payable by various kind of companies are stated in Scheduled X of Companies Act, 1956. These are reviewed from time to time.

**Increase in working days in courts**

397. SHRI YADLAPATI VENKAT RAO: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have asked the High Courts and the State Governments to re-examine the annual vacations and working days in High Courts to expedite disposal of large number of cases; and

(b) if so, the response of the State Governments in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Of the five State Governments which have so far responded, the Mizoram Government has supported the present ceiling of atleast 210 working

days per year for the High Court; the Government of Maharashtra, Goa and Jlajasthan have favoured increase in the number of annual working days of their respective High Courts; and the Government of Meghalaya has BO objection to the increase in the number of the working days in the High Court. The process of consultation is continuing.

**Legal Sanctity to Live-in Relationship**

398. SHRI K. RAMA M.OHANA RAO: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Allahabad High Court recently, delivered a judgement giving legal sanctity for live-in relationship;

(b) if so, the reaction of Government on this judgement;

(c) whether it is not going to affject our institution of marriage and the emotional bond linked to it; and

(d) if so, what his Ministry is contemplating in this regard to save the institution of marriage in the country?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) to (d) In the case of Payal Katara *Vs.* Superintendent, Nari Niketan, Kalindri Vihar, Agra and others, the Allahabad High Court upholding the constitutional right of the citizens as enshrined in articles 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India held that the petitioner, a lady about 21 years of age-being a major, has right to go anywhere and that anyone-man and woman even without getting married can live together if they wish. The judgement has not commented against the institution of marriage or its sanctity.

**Setting up of Sub-Bench of High Court Bench at Rajkot**

399. SHRI ANANTRAY DEVSHANKER DAVE: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any request from Government of Gujarat to set up a Sub-Bench of High Court Bench at Rajkot, Gujarat; and

(b) if so, the action taken by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY) (a) and (b) No, Sir. In fact Government of Gujarat